

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 1.

The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figure 1, replaces the original sheet including Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **DRAWINGS**

Applicants have attached a revised formal drawing with labels for each of the items to replace the previous informal version.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brotherston (WO 00/63806) in view of Arazi et al. (2001/0041594). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites: “[a] network architecture for selectively blocking access to a pay per use wide area network comprising... a connection sharing computer...; at least one network device comprising a network protocol address in a specific network protocol address range determined by the connection sharing computer..., wherein the connection sharing computer provides access to the wide area network to the network device; and at least one network protocol sniffer module [that] pings the network device in the specific network protocol address range to determine a presence of the network device and communicates the presence to the server such that access to the wide area network by the network device may be selectively blocked by disconnecting the

connection sharing computer from the wide area network.” Claims 12 and 19 recite similar features.

The invention as presently claimed thus calls for a connection sharing computer through which one or more network devices access a wide area network. The network devices have network protocol addresses which are dictated by the connection sharing computer. See Specification, paragraph 19. A network protocol sniffer module which is in communication with the server pings only those network protocol addresses which the connection sharing computer provides. See Specification, paragraph 20. Pinging the entire range of network protocol addresses possible for network devices connecting to the wide area network through the connection sharing computer can thus be completed within a few minutes. See Specification, paragraph 20. Once the presence of an unauthorized network device is detected, service may be discontinued to the connection sharing computer through which the unauthorized network device is accessing the network, thus preventing further access by the unauthorized network device. See Specification, paragraph 21. Additionally, a network operator may be notified of the unauthorized use of the network so they may take further action. See Specification, paragraph 21. In this manner, the unauthorized user is *unable to access the network at all*. Meanwhile, other network devices are allowed to continue their use of the network through other connection sharing computers. This allows an operator of a mobile platform to cut down on unauthorized use of the network, while not inhibiting access to the mobile network by authorized users.

The prior art of record neither discloses nor suggests such an arrangement. In the Office Action mailed June 16, 2005, the Examiner stated that the “Applicant fails to

consider the teaching of Brotherston's reference for verifying a user when the user attempts to access the network, and the network accessing may be selectively blocked [259-260, Fig. 13b; p.14, lines 12 – 18; p.22, lines 15 – 25], i.e., verifying whether the user is eligible to access the network service..." It is again respectfully submitted that Brotherston refers only to the verification of a user's credit card used for payment for services which are requested through the network, and denying only those services that are requested *through the network*. The user is simply not granted whatever services which they request through the network, such as beverages, food, etc. The user in the Brotherston reference is thus not restricted whatsoever from accessing the network to request products and services. Other sections of the Brotherston reference referred to by the Examiner similarly speak of credit card verification steps *only*. (Reference numbers 259 and 260 of Fig. 13-b correspond to the text at p.14, lines 12 – 18, which discusses the logic of the handheld devices to *verify the user's credit card payment* for services requested through the network; the text at p.22, lines 15 – 25 refers to the *credit card verification* step taken at the gate kiosks, and the subsequent access to the network provided to the user from that location.) Rejection of the user's credit card and subsequent withholding of products or services *does not disconnect the user from the network*, or otherwise restrict the user's access *to the network*.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Brotherston with Arazi does not render Claims 1, 12, or 19 obvious. Further, Claims 2 – 11, 13 – 18, and 20 depend from Claims 1, 12, and 19, respectively. Applicants thus believe these claims are also in condition for allowance, for the reasons cited above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Sept. 16, 2005

By:

Mark D. Elchuk

Mark D. Elchuk  
Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/sdo